

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~June 22nd, 1959COCOM Document No. 3416.35/12COORDINATING COMMITTEERECORD OF DISCUSSIONONUNITED KINGDOM PROPOSAL TO REDEFINE ITEM 1635 - ALLOYSJune 15th and 18th, 1959

Present: Belgium (Luxembourg), Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States.

References: COCOM Documents 3416.00/1, 3416.35/3 - 11.

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to the United States memorandum (COCOM 3416.35/9), which gave the reasons why the United States could not accept the United Kingdom redefinition proposal. He invited Delegates to give the views of their authorities.
2. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate asked what were the physical characteristics of the steels listed in paragraph 4(a) of the United States memorandum? He also asked when the United States redefinition proposal would be submitted?
3. The UNITED STATES Delegate replied that the redefinition proposal ~~or alternative proposals~~ would be submitted in the near future. He undertook to report to his authorities the United Kingdom request concerning the physical characteristics and said that he would be grateful for some clarification of what exactly the United Kingdom wanted to know.
4. The FRENCH Delegate, speaking personally, said that he understood physical characteristics to refer to the material results achieved by applying the chemical formulae given in the attachment to the United States memorandum. AISI type 321, for example, was a stainless steel with special high temperature characteristics and was thus used for certain military purposes. The rupture index of the steel and the creep properties of the alloys were other physical characteristics. The Delegate suggested that it would be preferable if the United States did not limit their remarks to chemical formulae alone, but gave the reasons why they considered these types of steel to be of strategic importance. Finally, he thought that the solution put forward in paragraph 4(c) of the United States memorandum would be unlikely to give rise to any difficulty.
5. The GERMAN Delegate expressed his personal opinion that his authorities, if they agreed wholly or partially with the substance of the United States proposal, which he could not foresee, would probably prefer the solution proposed in paragraph 4(c) of the United States memorandum. The Delegate subscribed to the suggestion of his French colleague that it would be useful to know why the United States considered these steels to be strategic.
6. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate commented that three of the types listed in paragraph 4(a) of COCOM 3416.35/9 - types 19-9DL, 19-9DX and WX - were not caught by the definition in COCOM 3300. Types 321, 347 and 348 had military applications but that was no guide to their strategic importance. A certain conversion chart data sheet equivalent list of United States aircraft materials mentioned only types 321 and 19-9DL.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

- 2 -

COCOM Document No. 3416.35/12

7. The UNITED STATES Delegate pointed out in response to his United Kingdom colleague's remarks that in paragraphs 1 and 2 of COCOM 3416.35/9 it was explained that some of the types not covered by the United Kingdom proposal had predominantly military uses.

8. The COMMITTEE agreed to continue the discussion on July 2nd.

9. On June 18th the UNITED KINGDOM Delegate elaborated his question (paragraph 2 above) by saying that by the term "physical characteristics" his authorities meant characteristics as distinct from metallurgical composition or analysis. This would include tensile strength, ductile strength and an indication of the temperatures to which the steels were resistant. Information on the uses to which they were put would also be useful. The Delegate continued that his authorities were firmly opposed to the redefinition on the lines suggested in paragraph 4(a) of COCOM 3416.35/9 because this would have the effect of embargoing material of purely commercial significance. The same objections existed in the case of the method suggested in paragraph 4(b). Paragraph 4(c) was still under consideration, but the preliminary reactions in the United Kingdom were not favourable.

10. The UNITED STATES Delegate said that he would ensure that the remarks made by the United Kingdom Delegate received full consideration by his authorities.

CONFIDENTIAL